DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 385 292 IR 055 578

AUTHOR Ford, Stephanie
TITLE Public Access to Electronic Federal Depository Information in Regional Depository Libraries.
PUB DATE Jul 95
NOTE 50p.; Master's Paper, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Undetermined (040) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Access to Information; Cataloging; *Depository Libraries; *Electronic Text; Federal Government; *Government Publications; Librarian Attitudes; Library Collections; Library Equipment; Library Personnel; Library Services
IDENTIFIERS Association of Research Libraries; Government Printing Office; Internet

ABSTRACT

This study describes regional depository institutions, the organization of their document collections, the staffing of their documents departments, and factors relevant to their providing access to electronic government information. Surveys were sent to 53 regional depository libraries in March 1995. Forty-one of the 53 libraries responded (77% response rate). A description of the basic characteristics of all 41 responding libraries was compiled by: library type; budget size for materials acquisition; full-time professionals; part-time professionals; and professional time spent on machine readable depository collection. Since public access to machine readable information is influenced by many factors, the survey considered the following factors: bibliographic control, availability of equipment, staff training, bibliographic instruction, promotional and outreach programs, peer connection, and librarian attitude. The data generated by this survey suggests that there is not much difference between academic Association of Research Libraries (ARL) and non-ARL regional depository libraries in their provision of public access to depository machine readable information. ARL regional libraries are more apt to serve larger populations and have larger materials budgets. Eighty percent of the reporting ARL regionals with OPACS include depository machine readable information in the OPAC, compared to 50% of the non-ARL regionals. Both types are equipped with public access workstations. A slightly higher percentage of non-ARL libraries provide public Internet access. Government Printing Office (GPO) access is equally provided, but ARL libraries are more likely to serve as gateways to GPO access. A majority of both types are engaged in various methods of staff training and bibliographic instruction. Examination also reveals little difference in state agencies, public, and historical society libraries. Data is illustrated in 36 tables, and an appendix provides the "Regional Depository Electronic Access Survey." (Contains 21 references and a 34-item bibliography.) (MAS)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

IR

PUBLIC ACCESS TO ELECTRONIC FEDERAL DEPOSITORY INFORMATION IN REGIONAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARIES

ED 385 292

by
Stephanie Ford

A Master's Paper submitted to the faculty
of the School of Information and Library Science
of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
in partial fufillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Science in
Library Science.

Chapel Hill, North Carolina

July, 1995

Approved by:

Ridley R. Kessler, Jr.
Advisor

IR055578

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Stephanie Ford

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Public access to Federal government information is a fundamental creed of American democratic ideals dating back to the Founding Fathers. In an oft quoted letter to W.T. Barry on August 4, 1822, James Madison wrote,

> A popular Government without popular information, or the mean of acquiring it, is but a Prologue to a Farce or a tragedy; or, perhaps both. Knowledge will forever govern ignorance: and a people who mean to be their own Governors, must arm themselves with the power which Knowledge gives. (Hunt 1910, 103)

Not until the Freedom of Information Act was enacted in 1966, was the abstract concept inherent to our society, that is, the importance of public access to government information as a precursor of free society, given statutory recognition.

Depository libraries, with a legislative history dating back to the 13th Congress in 1813 (3 Stat.140), play a large role in ensuring public access to Federal government information. Title 44, section 1911, of the United States Code states that, "Depository libraries shall make government publications available for the free use of the general public" (44 USC 1911). On June 8, 1993, the GPO Electronic Information Access Enhancement Act (P.L. 103-40) was signed into law by President Clinton. P.L. 103-40 requires GPO to provide online access to the Congressional Record, the Federal Register, and other publications. Also with this service, called GPO Access, the Government Printing Office (GPO) will provide access to archived electronic publications. In a statement upon signing this bill into law, President Clinton referred to the Act as an "important step forward in the electronic dissemination of Federal information" (GPO 1993, 1044).

Government information is being produced in electronic format in increasing amounts. In the 1993 Annual Report, GPO reports an increase in the distribution of Government publications in electronic format from 95,400 copies of 180 titles in 1992 to 167,000 copies of 292 titles in 1993 (GPO Annual Report 1993, 23). The federal government disseminates more than 7500 electronic databases each year (Kranich 1992, 108) The introduction of electronic information into the depository program presents challenges as well as opportunities to depository libraries. Libraries and librarians, with their long-standing committment to public access, are well positioned to assure public access to government information (Kranich 1992, 110). In order to accommodate information in the electronic format, however, expensive equipment and staff training are necessary. A large burden is being placed on depository libraries.

BACKGROUND

The 1399 depository libraries have a cooperative agreement with the Government Printing Office and the Federal government. A library risks losing depository status if it can not meet the objectives of the program. As a larger portion of government information is produced in electronic format, depository libraries must be able to provide the public with adequate access to these products effectively and efficiently (including reference service and technical processing); the depository program depends on this ability. The ability of depository libraries to accommodate the influx of information in electronic format must be assessed in aid of innovative strategic planning. A collective assessment of depository library problems and successes with electronic information will serve to strengthen the depository program as it prepares for the future. The peoples' right to know is at stake.

SIGNIFICANCE

In a study conducted for the Government Printing Office in 1988, Charles R. McClure and Peter Hernon found that an estimated minimum of 167,000 people use government depository material in academic and public libraries per week (McClure and Hernon 1989, 44). This figure is an indication of the social value of depository collections.

As demonstrated by the recent legislation mentioned above, the Federal government information producers are making a rapid transition to the electronic format. This transition has broad congressional as well as presidential support. Technology outpaces policy. In the words of the ARL Task Force report, Technology & U.S. Government Information Policies: Catalyst for New Partnerships,

> Government information---its creation and dissemination---is a microcosm of the elements and layers of a new paradigm for libraries. The prospect of GPO providing government information in electronic format to depository libraries accelerates the need for libraries to address the shifting paradigm and turn concepts into very real questions of library and public policy. (ARL 1987, 15)

Several years have passed since any studies of depository libraries and their provision of public access to electronic information have been conducted. This study provides a picture of the current situation.

LITERATURE REVIEW

A survey of the literature of recent years reveals much writing about the impact of electronic Federal information on depository libraries. Most of the writing is opinion, anecdotal, and historical, but some research is reported.

Robert E. Dugan and Joan F. Cheverie, in the article, "Electronic Government Information and the Depository Library Program: Paradise Found?", present a historical analysis of the dissemination of Federal information in

electronic format. By the 1980's, Federal agencies were issuing a significant amount of electronic products. Nevertheless, electronic products were not introduced into the Depository Library Program until the 1990's, and only after lobbying efforts by depository libraries. Depository librarians expressed concern that Federal information being produced electronically, but not distributed to depositories, was restricting access to Federal government information.

The authors report on a General Accounting Office (GAO) survey conducted in 1988 that led to the conclusion that depository libraries were increasingly incorporating electronic technology into their operations. A 1990 Depository Library Program (DLP) survey found an increased number of depositories using this technology. The 1990 DLP survey results revealed that 74% of the depository libraries had CD-ROM equipment, a marked increase from the 37% with this equipment according to the 1988 GAO survey.

Dugan and Cheverie point out some early problems concerning legislative, policy, technical, and staff stress issues. They further point out that, at time this article was written in 1992, it remained questionable whether depository libraries were technologically sophisticated enough to support electronic government information. Although studies showed that depository librarians were eager to provide access to electronic information, administrative and technological constraints remained. Current research will show that depositories are overcoming early obstacles.

Peter Hernon and Charles R. McClure summarize and overview a study conducted in 1990 to review the use of U.S. Census products intended for distribution to depository libraries in the article, "Electronic Census Products and the Depository Library Program: Future Issues and Trends." The study utilized focus group discussions for data collection. Results indicated vast discrepancies between smaller and larger depository libraries, and that this gap is apt to widen

as the expectation for the use of electronic technology grows. Smaller depositories may not have the resources that enable them to provide public access to electronic government information. Technological awareness and expertise discrepancies exist also. This study identified six issues considered most important by the depository librarians included: user friendliness of the census CD-ROMs, availability of the product through the depository program, ability of depository libraries to provide the necessary information handling equipment, restructure of the Depository Library Program, cost sharing, and the possibility of user fees. These six issues highlight concerns of depository librarians regarding electronic government information. The authors express the need for a strategic plan for a system that will best provide public access to electronic depository information.

Diane H. Smith's article, "Depository Libraries in the 1990s: Whither or Wither Depositories?", presents the results of a survey of 93 academic depository libraries conducted in 1990. All 93 libraries were Association of Research Library (ARL) members with Federal depository collections. Smith chose this sample based on the assumption that ARL member libraries represent the depositories with the greatest financial resources and most technological innovation, as well as the most knowledgeable staff. Furthermore, an ARL Task Force had examined electronic information in 1987. This study investigated such things as bibliographic control of depository collections, management, staffing, electronic resources, equipment, and depository librarian and Assistant Director opinions about the cost/benefits of electronic government information. Smith concluded that the data generated by this 1990 study raise serious questions about whether depository libraries have "sufficient resources, support, or staff trained to deal with electronic data" (Smith 1990, 312).

Subsequent studies indicate that depositories are beginning to adapt to an electronic environment. Ridley R. Kessler and Evelyn H. Daniel conducted a survey of regional depository libraries in 1989. This survey collected information about the organization and operation of these libraries. 45 of 52 regionals responded to the Kessler survey for a 87% response rate. Kessler and Daniel concluded that regional libraries were adapting well to the increased use of computers and were "well prepared to face the technological changes of the future" (Kessler and Daniel 1989, 19).

In the summer of 1994, the Library Programs Service (LPS) of the Government Printing Office conducted a survey of all 1391 depositories. The published result of this study is Electronic Capabilities of Federal Depository Libraries, Summer 1994. The primary goal of this survey was to provide means for assessment of depository library computer equipment capabilities and covered basic equipment, software, and networking. The survey asked questions about equipment available for use by depository patrons. Overall response rate was 83%, with 100% of the regional depositories responding. LPS concluded that, "Depository libraries have made enormous progress in positioning themselves to serve the public with electronic Government information." (GPO 1994, 41)

SURVEY

This study is a descriptive analysis of regional depository library capabilities and practice in providing the public with access to electronic federal government information. Surveys were sent to the 53 Regional Depository libraries in March 1995. This population was chosen for several reasons. First, the regional depositories are the foundation of the Depository Library Program (DLP), and in carrying out their responsibilities, they provide the basis for which the DLP is able to accomplish its mission. Second, most of the regional depositories are housed in academic, state agency, or large public libraries. The

assumption here is that these institutions are more apt to have larger budgets, necessary to accommodate any transition to electronic information, than the institutions housing the selective depository libraries. Third, because the regionals are responsible for collecting all of the items the GPO sends them, the pressure to provide access to electronic government information is greater for regionals. Finally, I was able to use a survey of regional depository libraries done by Ridley R. Kessler and Evelyn H. Daniel in 1989 for survey question ideas and comparisons (Kessler and Daniel 1989). A study of the regionals will lead to some conclusions and assumptions about the larger population of depository libraries that includes selective as well as regional depository libraries.

41 of the 53 regional depository libraries sent surveys responded for a 77% response rate. The sample is not large enough for extensive hypotheses testing, but does provide enough information for a descriptive analysis. Specifically, this study seeks to describe the regional depository institutions, organization of the documents collections, staffing of the documents departments, and factors relevant to providing access to electronic government information. Anonymity was guaranteed with the survey, and therefore the identification of individual regionals is not made. This summary begins with a description of basic characteristics of all 41 responding libraries. Later, some factors of special importance to public access to government information are discussed.

INSTITUTION AND ORGANIZATION

15, or 36.5%, of the 41 responding libraries are academic libraries, members of Association of Research Libraries (ARL). I refer to these as academic ARL throughout this paper. Academic, non ARL member libraries, (refered to as academic non ARL) are numbered at 12, or 29.2%. Thus, a total of 27, or 65.8% are academic libraries. 10, or 24.3% are state agency libraries, 3, or .07% are public libraries, and 1, a historical society library, fits the category as

"other'. Table 1 below shows these figures. These figures correspond closely with those of the Kessler/Daniel study.

Table 1. Library Type

• Academic ARL (15, or 36.5%)
• Academic non ARL (12 or 29.2%)
• State agency (10, or 24.3%)
• Public (3, or .07%)
• Other, historical society (1)

25, or 61% of the 41 responding libraries have separate budgets for materials acquisition; 10, or 24.4% have shared budgets; and 6, or 14.6% have no budget. The 25 libraries with separate budgets for materials acquisition are able to report budget size. Among the 25 with separate budgets are 13 academic ARL, 8 academic non ARL, and 4 state agency libraries, distributed as shown below in Table 2.

Table 2. Budget Size For Materials Acquisition

• $1000-4999	9	(3 academic ARL, 4 academic non ARL, 2 state)
• $5000-9999	4	(1 academic ARL, 3 academic non ARL)
• $10000-24999	1	(1 academic ARL)
• $25000-49999	3	(3 academic ARL)
• >50000	8	(5 academic ARL, 1 academic non ARL, 2 state)

All 41 libraries have either a separate documents collection arrangement (27, or 65.9%), or a separate but partially integrated collection arrangement (14, or 34.1%). The percentage of the documents collection kept separate ranges from 50-100%.

STAFFING

The number of full time professional librarians working in the documents collections of the 41 responding libraries ranges from 0 to 9. 1 is the most frequently occurring number of full time professionals; 12 of the 41 libraries report having 1 full time professional . The number of full time professional librarians

working in the documents collections of the 41 libraries in total is 106, or almost 3 full time professionals per library. 3 libraries report having 0 full time professional librarians working in the documents collection.

Table 3. Full Time Professionals

# Full Time Professionals	# Occurrences, percent of total
• 0	3, 7.3%
• 1	12, 29.3%
• 2	9, 22%
• 3	7, 17.1%
• 4	1, 2.4%
• 5	6, 14.6%
• 6	2, 4.9%
• 9	1, 2.4%

There are a total of 40 part time professional librarians among the 41 libraries; amounts range from 0 to 11. 27 libraries report having 0 part time professionals working in the documents collection.

Table 4. Part Time Professionals

# Part Time Professionals	# Occurrences, percent of total
• 0	27, 65.9%
• 1	5, 12.2%
• 2	4, 9.8%
• 3	3, 7.3%
• 7	1, 2.4%
• 11	1, 2.4%

39 libraries responded to the question on number of hours per week that professional librarians devote to the documents collection. Professional librarian hours per week devoted to documents for these 39 libraries ranges from 20 (1 occurrence) to 253 (1 occurrence). The library reporting 20 hours per week devoted to documents is an academic non ARL library with one part time

professional working in the documents collection; the library reporting 253 hours per week devoted to documents is a state agency library with 5 full time and 11 part time professional librarians working in the documents collection. 13 libraries report that professional librarians devote between 20 and 60 hours per week to the documents collection, 12 report between 61 and 100 hours per week, and 14 report between 105 and 253 hours per week. Again, these figures correspond closely to those given in the Kessler and Daniel study done in 1989 (Kessler and Daniel 1989).

Only 30 libraries responded to the question on the number of hours per week that professional librarians devote to the machine readable depository collection. This question must be difficult to answer. This is evident in the non response rate to this question, and telling written comments such as, "impossible to figure." One librarian responded that although this time is not kept track of, the increase in professional time devoted to machine readable depository information maintenance and public service has certainly increased. The hours of professional time spent on machine readable depository collection of these 30 regionals range from 0-85 hours per week. 24 libraries report between 0-20 hours per week devoted to the machine readable depository collection, and 6 report between 30-85 hours per week. Table 5 below shows the percentages of professional time spent on the machine readable depository collection at these 30 regionals.

Table 5. % Professional Time Spent on Machine Readable Depository Collection

% Time Spent Per Week	# Occurrences
<10%	10
10-24%	11
25-50%	7
51-100%	2

A single regional, a state agency library, responded that 100% of its professional time per week is devoted to the machine readable depository collection.

PUBLIC ACCESS TO MACHINE READABLE GOVERNMENT INFORMATION

Public access to machine readable government information is influenced by many factors, such as, bibliographic control, availability of equipment, staff training, bibliographic instruction, promotional and outreach activities, peer connection and librarian attitude. This survey attempted to gather information that will allow an assessment of these factors, or at least illustrate the current situation.

ONLINE PUBLIC ACCESS CATALOGS

In her 1990 study of ARL depositories, Diane H. Smith reported that the libraries tended to use online public access catalogs (OPAC's) (Smith 1990, 305). Smith further reported that the tendency to include high percentages of depository items in the OPAC was not so strong, with only a small percentage of the respondents doing so (305). The study currently being reported reveals the same tendencies. 38, or 92.7% of the 41 libraries responding have OPAC's; 3, or 7.3% do not have OPAC's. Only 1 public and 2 state agency libraries do not have OPAC's. All academic ARL and non ARL libraries, 2 of the 3 public libraries, 8 of the 10 state agency libraries, and the historical society library have OPAC's. However, only 27, or 71.1% of these 38 libraries include the bibliographic records of the depository machine readable collection in the OPAC's. Among the 11 depositories that do not include the bibliographic records of the depository machine readable collection in the OPAC's are 3 academic ARL, 6 academic non ARL, 1 public, and 1 state agency library.

There appears to be no relationship between inclusion of the bibliographic records of the depository machine readable collection in the OPAC and electronic resources available to depository users. For example, all 11 of the above mentioned depositories have workstations specifically designated for public use of depository products and services. 7 have public access Internet workstations, and at 1 the librarians have access and provide intermediary service to the public. 8 provide access to GPO Access; 4 on-site, 4 gateways. This indicates that including the bibliographic records of the depository collection in the institution's OPAC may be more problematic for some depositories than providing public service for and public access to depository information in electronic format. The inclusion of bibliographic records in the OPAC is a separate problem for many depositories and factors such as departmental coordination, expense, and questions on who is responsible must be resolved.

DEPOSITORY MACHINE READABLE INFORMATION

The collections of 41 or 100% of the libraries include items in machine readable format. Machine readable formats available for public access among the 41 responding libraries are available as follows:

Table 6. Formats available

Format	# Occurrences, percent of total
• Floppy Disks	36, or 87.8%
• CD-ROM's	41, or 100%
• Video Disks	3, or 7.3%
• Internet	30, or 73.2%

Note here that access to the two most important formats, CD-ROM and Internet, are highly supported, with 100% of the responding libraries providing public access to depository CD-ROm's, and 73.2% providing public access to the Internet.

On a composite index of formats available, 4, or 9.8% rank 1, providing public access to only 1 of the above formats. 7, or 17.1% rank 2, providing public access to 2 of the formats. 28, or 68.3% rank 3, providing public access to 3 of the formats, and 2, or 4.9% rank 4, providing access to all 4 of the formats. Table 7 below shows the composite index ranking for format availability by library type.

Table 7. Formats Available Ranking by Library Type

Library Type	Index Ranking				
	1	2	3	4	
• Academic ARL	2	2	11	0	= 15
• Academic non ARL	1	1	8	2	= 12
• Public	1	1	1	0	= 3
• State agency	0	3	7	0	= 10
• Other (historical society)	0	0	1	0	= 1

The depository CD-ROM 's and floppy disks of 15 or 37.5% of the libraries are kept in documents in an open stack area or networked on a local area network (LAN), and those of 14 or 35% are kept locked in the documents department. Thus, these items are located in the documents departments, locked or open, of a total of 29 or 72.5% of the responding libraries, indicating that the documents departments control access to the depository machine readable collection at a majority of the regionals, whether the collection is kept locked or open.

8 or 19.5% of the responding libraries keep their collection of CD-ROM's and floppy disks open or on a LAN in the public service or reference department, while only 3 or 7.5% keep this collection locked in the public service or reference department, for a total of 11 or 27.5% in the public service/reference departments.

Table 8. Machine Readable Collection Location

Location	# Occurrences, percent of total
• Documents, locked	14, or 35%
• Documents, open stack or on LAN	15, or 37.5%
• Public Services/Ref, locked	3, or 7.5%
• Public Services/Ref, open stack or on LAN	8, or 19.5%

Looking at the figures another way, 23 or 57.5% of the libraries keep this part of their collection open in either the documents or public service/reference departments, and 17 or 42.5% of the libraries keep this part of their collection locked.

Only 12 or 29.3% of the responding libraries track patron interest in or requests for machine readable depository information. Therefore, only 12 are able to provide information on the number of times this information is used in an average 5-day period and, unfortunately, no statistical significance can be determined about the relationship between collection location and use.

30, or 73.2% of the 41 responding regionals provide public access to the Internet. The types of Internet applications provided are shown below. Note that Telnet and FTP are made available to the public by 61% and 43.9% of the responding regionals, respectively. This is an improvement on the 34% of regionals that reported providing public access to these services in the GPO survey in the summer of 1994 (GPO 1994, 28).

Table 9. Internet Applications

Internet Application	# Occurrences, percent of total
WWW	23, or 56.1%
Gopher	30, or 73.2%
Telnet	25, or 61%
FTP	18, or 43.9%
WAIS	22, or 53.7%

The composite index ranking of the number of these applications available for public access indicates that the majority of regionals that offer any of these services offer 4 or 5 of them. (Table 10)

Table 10. Ranking of Internet Applications Available by Library Type

Library Type	Index Ranking						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	
• Academic ARL	3	0	2	2	1	7	=15
• Academic non ARL	2	1	1	2	1	5	= 12
• Public	1	0	1	0	1	0	= 3
• State agency	4	0	2	0	2	2	= 10
• Other (historical society)	0	0	0	1	0	0	= 1

EQUIPMENT

41, or 100% of the responding libraries have workstations available for public use of depository products and services. 25 have 1-5 workstations available, 11 have 6-10, and 5 have 11 or more. Table 11 below shows the number of workstations available for public use of depository products and services for each range of population served. Table 11 indicates number of workstations available by library type.

Table 11. Documents Workstations by Population Served

Population Served	1-5 workstations	6-10 workstations	11-15 workstations
200,000 or more	13	5	3
100,000-199,000	3	2	1
50,000-99,999	4	3	
25,000-49,999	3	1	
10,000-24,999	2		1

Table12. Documents Workstations by Library Type

Library Type	1-5 workstations	6-10 workstations	11-15 workstations
Academic ARL	8	6	1
Academic non ARL	7	3	2
Public	2		1
State agency	7	2	1
Other (hist. society)	1		

As for workstations specifically designated for use by depository patrons; 30 have 1-5 workstations, 6 have 6-10, and 3 have 11 or more. 2 libraries have 0 workstations designated specifically for documents users.

Table 13. Workstations Specifically for Docs by Library Type

Library Type	1-5 workstations	6-10 workstations	11-15 workstations
Academic ARL	10	3	1
Academic non ARL	9	2	1
Public	2		1
State agency	8	1	
Other (hist. society)	1		

Separating those 25 regionals with separate budgets, and therefore able to respond to the budget size question, seems to reveal that there is no correlation between budget size and number of workstations specifically designated for use by depository patrons, as shown in Table 14 below.

Table 14. Workstations Specifically for Docs by Budget Size

Budget Size	1-5 workstations	6-10 workstations	11+ workstations
$1000-$4999	6	2	1
$5000-$9999	3	1	
$10,000-$24,000		1	
$25,000-$49,999	2	1	
>$50,000	6	1	1

30, or 73.2% of the 41 responding libraries have workstations for public access to the Internet, 26 of these 30 have workstations specifically designated for use by depository patrons' access to the Internet.

Table 15. Internet Workstations by Population Served

Population Served	1-5 workstations	6-10 workstations	11+ workstations
200,000 or more	9	2	4
100,000-199,000	3	1	2
50,000-99,999	4		
25,000-49,999	2		1
10,000-24,999	1		1

Table 16. Internet Workstations by Library Type

Library Type	1-5 workstations	6-10 workstations	11+ workstations
Academic ARL	6	2	3
Academic non ARL	6	1	4
Public	1		1
State agency	5		
Other (hist. society)	1		

GPO ACCESS

31 or 78% of the 41 responding regionals provide public access to GPO Access. At the time of this survey, 11 academic ARL, 9 academic non ARL, 1 public, 9 state, and the historical society library provided access to GPO Access. One public library responded that it would soon. Among the 10 regionals that do not provide public access to GPO Access are 4 academic ARL libraries, 3 academic non ARL libraries, 2 public libraries, and 1 state agency library. See Table 17 below for a breakdown of level of GPO Access by library type.

Table 17. GPO Access Level by Library Type

Library Type	On Site	Extended On Site	Gateway
• Academic ARL	5	1	5
• Academic non ARL	7		2
• Public			1
• State agency	7		2
• Other (historical society)	1		

As shown in the table above, 20 regionals provide GPO Access at the on-site level, 1 regional provides extended on-site service, and 10 regionals act as gateways. All 31 regionals that provide public access to GPO Access subscribe to the Federal Register, Congressional Record, and Congressional Bills databases. The GPO Access support person registered with GPO is part of the documents staff of 27 of the 31 regionals with GPO Access.

A gateway provides free 24-hour remote public access to GPO Access to anyone with the necessary equipment and communications software. As stated in the GPO pamphlet, "GPO Access: Information For Depository Libraries," depositories acting as gateways accept full responsibility for user support of on and off-site users, including "connection of off-site users to the gateway server, use of communications software, and assisting users with limited technical expertise." (GPO 1995, 16)

10 of the 41 regionals responding provide GPO Access at the gateway level. 5 are academic ARL, 2 are non Academic ARL, 1 is a public, and 2 are state agency libraries. 8 of these 10 provide service to a population of 200,000 or more, while the other 2 serve populations of 100,000-199,999 and 50,000-99,999, respectively. As for staffing, 5 of these regionals have 1 full time professional librarian; 3 have 2, 1 has 3, and 1 has 4. Only 4 have part time professional librarian librarians. Among these 10 regionals, hours of professional time devoted to documents each week ranges from 30-140 hours, while hours of professional time devoted to the machine readable depository collection of these 10 regionals each week ranges from 2-85 hours. Hours of support staff time devoted to documents each week ranges from 30-220 hours, while hours of support staff time devoted to the machine readable depository collection of these 10 regionals each week ranges from 1-50 hours.

All 10 gateway regionals have OPAC's, but only 5 have included the depository machine readable collection in the OPAC. This adds credence to the notion that the level of sophistication in providing access to depository information in electronic format has no relationship to inclusion of the depository machine readable collection in the OPAC

STAFF TRAINING

40 regionals responded to the question of staff training; 1 academic non ARL did not respond to the question. 37, or 92.5% of the 40 responding libraries do train depository staff in providing public service for depository machine readable collections. Table 18 below represents the staff training distribution by library type.

Table 18. Staff Training

Type of Library	# Occurrences
• Academic ARL	14
• Academic non ARL	11
• Public	2
• State agency	9
• Other (historical society)	1

14 of 15 academic ARL libraries, 11 of 12 academic non ARL libraries, 2 of 3 public libraries, 9 of 10 state agency libraries, and the one historical society library responding to this survey train their staff for this public service. Training method choices on the survey are: workshops, training, or classes held by staff; workshops, training, or classes held by federal government agency personnel; workshops, training, or classes held by outside experts, other than government experts, and other. Table 19 shows how the 37 regionals responded to this question.

Table 19. Type of Staff Training

Type of Training	# Occurrences, percent of total
• Workshops, etc. by staff	32, or 86.5%
• Workshops, etc. by federal govt.	20, or 54.1%
• Workshops, etc. by non govt. expert	11, or 29.7%
• Other	8, or 21.6%

The "other" types of staff training done are: self taught, state wide documents associations, training with university professors, and "on the fly."

On a composite index of staff training in providing public service for depository machine readable collections, 4 of the 41 libraries are ranked 0, meaning that they provide no such staff training; 14 are ranked 1, meaning they use one method of training; 13 are ranked 2, using 2 methods; 9 are ranked 3, using 3 methods, and 1 is ranked 4, using 4 methods. The single library ranking 4 on the staff training composite index provides staff training through the following means: workshops, training, or classes held by own staff; workshops, training, or classes held by federal government agency personnel; workshops, training, or classes held by outside experts, other than government experts; and other ("self teaching"). Table 20 below shows the composite index of staff training by library type.

Table 20. Staff Training Ranking by Library Type

Library Type	Index Ranking					
	0	1	2	3	4	
• Academic ARL	1	3	6	5	0	= 15
• Academic non ARL	1	6	3	2	0	= 12
• Public	1	0	1	1	0	= 3
• State agency	1	4	3	1	1	= 10
• Other (historical society)	0	1	0	0	0	= 1

PROMOTIONAL ACTIVITIES

29, or 70.7% of the 41 depositories engage in some sort of promotional or outreach activities to inform the general public about the depository machine

readable collection. Of the 12, or 29.3% that do not, 4 are academic ARL, 4 are academic non ARL, 2 are public, and 2 are state agency libraries. One depository librarian at an academic non ARL library provided a written comment that although they wish they could engage in promotional activities they do not have the time, or personnel, to do so.

Workshops are used by 16, or 39% of the responding depositories to promote the depository machine readable collection. Brochures are the most frequently used form of outreach, used by 23, or 56.1%, while newspapers are only used by 8, or 19.5%. 3 depositories report using "other" types of promotional activities, such as, reference contacts; information in the university gopher; publicity to selective depositories; bibliographic instruction; newsletters. Tables 21 and 22 below show the breakdown of types of promotional or outreach activities used and use by library type.

Table 21. Promotional Activities

Type of Promotion	# Occurrences, percent of total
• No promotion	12, or 29.3%
• Workshops or group demos	16, or 39%
• Brochures and handouts	23, or 56.1%
• Newspapers, press release	8, or 19.5%
• Other	3, or 7.3%

Table 22. Promotional Activities by Library Type

Library Type	Workshops	Brochures	Newspaper
• Academic ARL	7	8	3
• Academic non ARL	4	6	2
• Public	0	1	1
• State agency	4	7	2
• Other (historical society)	1	1	0

On a composite index of promotional or outreach activities done to inform the general public about the depository machine readable collection 12 of the 41 regionals are ranked 0, meaning they do no promotion; 12 are ranked 1, meaning

they engage in 1 type of outreach or promotional activity; 14 are ranked 2, engaging in two types of outreach or promotional activity; 2 are ranked 3; and 1 is ranked 4. Ranking on promotional or outreach activities done by library type is shown in Table 23 below.

Table 23. Promotional Activities Ranking by Library Type

Library Type	Index Ranking					
	0	1	2	3	4	
• Academic ARL	4	4	6	1	0	= 15
• Academic non ARL	4	4	3	1	0	= 12
• Public	2	0	1	0	0	= 3
• State agency	2	4	3	0	1	= 10
• Other (historical society)	0	0	1	0	0	= 1

A single library ranks 4 on the composite index of promotion, meaning that it engages in workshops, brochures and handouts, newspaper articles or press release, and other promotional or outreach activities. This library is further described later in the summary.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC INSTRUCTION

40, or 97.6% of the responding regionals do some type of bibliographic instruction for patrons to assist them in using depository machine readable information, only 1 library reports doing no such bibliographic instruction. See Table 23. In the 1989 study Kessler and Daniel found a similarly strong commitment to bibliographic instruction of the depository collection in general, with 40, or 89% of the regionals reporting that they provided bibliographic instruction (Kessler and Daniel 1989, 14).

Table 24. Bibliographic Instruction by Library Type

Library Type	# Occurrences
• Academic ARL	15 of 15
• Academic non ARL	12 of 12
• Public	3 of 3
• State agency	9 of 10
• Other (historical society)	1 of 1

One on one bibliographic instruction in using depository machine readable information is done by 39, or 95.1% of the responding regionals. Classroom bibliographic instruction is done by 17, or 41.5%; other bibliographic instruction is done by 5, or 12.2%. Other types of bibliographic instruction reported are: occasional workshops, small classes by appointment, group training to staff

On a composite index of bibliographic instruction, 1 library is ranked 0, 21 are ranked 1, 17 are ranked 2, and 2 are ranked 3. As with the composite rankings of the other factors, these rankings reflect the number of types of the activity a regional engages in, or services it provides. Table 25. below reveals the index ranking for bibliographic instruction for each library type.

Table 25. Bibliographic Instruction Ranking by Library Type

Library Type	Index Ranking				
	0	1	2	3	
• Academic ARL	0	5	9	1	= 15
• Academic non ARL	0	5	6	1	= 12
• Public	0	3	0	0	= 3
• State agency	1	7	2	0	= 10
• Other (historical society)	0	1	0	0	= 1

PEER CONNECTION

37 of the 41 responding regionals subscribe to Regional-L, broken down by library type as follows: academic ARL-14, academic non ARL-10, public-3, state agency-9, and historical society-1. 12 of these 37 also subscribe to a local list and 6 administer this list. 27 of the 41 provide E-Mail reference to selective

depositories and other libraries in their region. (Table 26.) When responding negatively to the question about E-Mail reference to selectives, one librarian commented that many selectives do not have E-Mail.

Only 1 academic ARL, 2 academic non ARL, and 1 state agency do not subscribe to Regional-L. 2 of these 4 report that they plan to subscribe as soon as they have the capability, which should be soon. 3 of these 4 have a local list, and 2 administer this local list.

Table 26. Peer Connection by Library Type

Library Type	Regional-L	Local List	Administer Local List	E-Mail Reference
• Academic ARL	14	6	6	9
• Academic non ARL	10	3	1	9
• Public	3	1	0	1
• State agency	9	5	1	7
• Other (historical society)	1	0	0	1

ATTITUDE TOWARD MACHINE READABLE DEPOSITORY INFORMATION

All 41 regionals responded to the survey question, " Do you think depository information in machine readable format will improve patron access?" 34, or 82.9% do think that depository information in machine readable format will improve patron access. 3 do not, and the responses of 4 communicate ambivalence or uncertainty.

Table 27. Attitude by Library Type

Library Type	Will Improve	Will Not Improve	Uncertain or Maybe
• Academic ARL	12	1	2
• Academic non ARL	10	1	1
• Public	2	0	1
• State agency	10	0	0
• Other (historical society)	0	1	0

Some of the written comments emphasize concerns. For example, a librarian responding from an academic ARL library replied that although depository information in machine readable format has the potential to improve patron access, many individuals and libraries lack the technology necessary to support it. Another academic ARL librarian commented that, "until the Internet is more easily accessed by everyone, there will be the 'haves' and 'have nots'." One public librarian expressed concern about the many "unanswered questions" about archival format, notification of changing format, and development of software appropriate for use in libraries.

One anonymous academic ARL librarian, although believing that depository information in machine readable format will improve patron access, provided the following written comment:

> Providing access to electronic information imposes enormous new pressures on Regionals. They are expected to be familiar with all the various sources, and to provide information and training for their selectives as well as their own users. Electronic service requires new kinds of cooperation and communication within each institution, with both administration and outside the documents unit.

HIGH ON PROMOTION

One library ranks 4 on the composite index of promotion, using workshops, brochures and handouts, newspaper articles or press releases, and other outreach or promotional activities. This library is particularly strong in promotional activities, therefore, it is interesting to examine some of the other characteristics of this library. It is a comprehensive state library serving a population of over 3 million. 2 professional librarians are employed full time in the documents collection, none part time. The documents collection is arranged separately, and it has a separate budget of over $50,000. This library does have an OPAC, with all except 29,000 depository items included in it. Machine readable formats available for public access are: floppy disks, CD-ROM's, and video disks, giving this library a

ranking of 3 on the composite index of machine readable formats available. 2 workstations are specifically designated for use by depository patrons. There is a method in place at this regional to track patron interest in, or use of, depository machine readable information, and such use occurs 16-20 times in an average 5-day period. The staff is trained in providing public service for the depository machine readable collection through workshops, training or classes held by its own staff; and through workshops, training or classes held by federal government agency personnel. Bibliographic instruction is done for patrons with one on one instruction and classroom instruction.

This state agency library has no public access Internet workstations, but does provide SWAIS direct dial on-site access to GPO Access, through a librarian. Public access Internet workstations are expected soon. Without full access to the Internet, this regional cannot subscribe to Regional-L, much to the librarian's displeasure, but does subscribe to a local list. The librarian responding to the survey is very optimistic about public access to depository information in machine readable format, and provided the following written comment," My vision of the future: 90% in CD-ROM or accessible file formats, 10% in paper, and I want it ASAP."

ACADEMIC ARL AND NON ARL

Kessler and Daniels posed some questions in the summary of their 1989 survey of regional depository libraries. Addressing their question, "Is there any difference between those regionals that belong to the Association of Research Libraries and those that do not?", this section uses the results of the current survey to show some differences and similarities between these two types of libraries (Kessler and Daniels 1989, 19).

As noted earlier, a total of 27, or 65.8% of the responding libraries are academic libraries. 15 of the 27 academic libraries are members of ARL; 12 are not members of ARL.

As Table 28 below illustrates, although the relationship between population size and ARL /non ARL is somewhat mixed, non ARL libraries tend to serve smaller populations. A total of 13, or 86.6% of the 15 ARL libraries serve populations of 50,000 or more, while 7, or 58.3% of the 12 non ARL libraries serve populations of 50,000 or more. 6, or 40% of the ARL member libraries serve populations of 200,000 or more; 3, or 25% of the non ARL members serve populations of 200,000 or more. Neither serves populations of less than 10,000.

Table 28. Population Served by ARL and Non ARL Academic Libraries

Population Size	ARL	Non ARL
200,000 or more	6, or 40%	3, or 25%
100,000-199,999	2, or 13.3%	3, or 25%
50,000-99,999	5, or 33.3%	1, or 8.3%
25,000-49,999	2, or 13.3%	2, or 16.7%
10,000-24,999	0	3, or 25%

A majority of both ARL and non ARL libraries have separate budgets for materials acquisitions. Specifically, 13, or 86.7% of the ARL libraries, and 8, or 66.7% of the non ARL libraries have separate budgets. 2 ARL and 2 non ARL libraries report shared budgets. All ARL libraries report having some budget that the regional librarian controls, while 2 non ARL libraries report having no budget.

Not all libraries were able to report budget size. Again the results are mixed, but the non ARL regionals reporting tend to have smaller budgets, as shown below in Table 29.

Table 29. Budget Size of ARL and Non ARL Academic Libraries

Budget Size	ARL	Non ARL
>$50,000	5	1
$25,000-$49,999	4	-
$10,000-$24,999	1	-
$5,000-$9,999	1	3
$1,000-$4,999	3	5

15, or 100% of the ARL libraries have OPAC'S, and 12, or 80% of these include depository machine readable information in the OPAC. 12, or 100% of the non ARL libraries have OPAC's; and 6, or 50% include depository machine readable information in the OPAC.

As noted earlier, the depository collections of all of these libraries contain items in machine readable format. The machine readable depository collection of CD-ROM's and diskettes is kept in the documents department of 71.5% of the ARL libraries, and 83.3% of the non ARL libraries, rather than in public services/reference, again indicating that documents departments have control of the machine readable depository collection in a majority of the libraries.

100% of the ARL and non ARL libraries report having depository CD-ROM's available for public access. Public workstations are available at all ARL, and all non ARL libraries. The number of workstations available by library type is shown below.

Table 30. Documents Workstations by Library Type

Library Type	1-5 workstations	6-10 workstations	11-15 workstations
Academic ARL	8, or 53.3%	6, or 40%	1, or 6.7%
Academic non ARL	7, or 58.3%	3, or 25%	2, or 16.7%

There are few significant differences between ARL and non ARL in workstations available. Nevertheless, there is a slight tendency for non

ARL 's to have fewer workstations specifically designated for use by depository patrons. Compare Table 30 and Table 31, and note that the distribution remains the same for ARL libraries and changes slightly for non ARL libraries.

Table 31. Workstations Specifically for Documents by Library Type

Library Type	1-5 workstations	6-10 workstations	11-15 workstations
Academic ARL	8, or 53.3%	6, or 40%	1, or 6.7%
Academic non ARL	9, or 75%	2, or 16.7%%	1, or 8.3%%

Public access to the Internet is provided by 11, or 73.3% of the ARL libraries, and by 11, or 91.7% of the non ARL libraries. Distribution of public access Internet workstations at these libraries is shown in the tables below. Again, there is no significant difference.

Table 32. Public Internet Workstations by Library Type

Library Type	1-5 workstations	6-10 workstations	11 or more	
Academic ARL	6	2	3	= 11
Academic non ARL	6	1	4	= 11

Table 33. Public InternetWorkstations Specifically for Documents

Library Type	1-5 workstations	6-10 workstations	11 or more	
Academic ARL	5	1	2	= 8
Academic non ARL	7	2	1	= 9

A majority of ARL and non ARL libraries provide public access to the following Internet applications: World Wide Web (WWW), gopher, telnet, ftp, and WAIS. ARL and non ARL library regionals provide these services about equally.

Table 34. Internet Applications Provided by ARL and non ARL Libraries

Internet Application	ARL	Non ARL
WWW	10, or 66.7%	8, or 72.7%
Gopher	12, or 80%	9, or 81.8%
Telnet	9, or 60%	8, or 72.7%
FTP	9, or 60%	6, or 54.5%
WAIS	9, or 60%	7, or 63.6%

11, or 73.3% of the ARL libraries provide GPO Access; and 9, or 75% of the non ARL libraries provide GPO Access. This survey reveals that ARL libraries are more likely to serve as gateways to GPO Access than non ARL libraries. 5, or 38.5% of the ARL libraries are gateways, 5 provide on-site GPO Access, and 1 provides extended on-site access. 2, or 22.2% of the non ARL libraries are gateways, and 7 provide on-site GPO Access. The GPO Access support person registered with GPO is part of the documents staff at a majority of these libraries.

As shown below in Table 35, Academic ARL and non ARL library regionals are similar in providing staff training and bibliographic instruction. While a majority of the regionals engage in some promotional or outreach activity to inform the general public about the depository machine readable collection, there is less tendency to promote the use of depository services than to train the staff or do bibliographic instruction.

Table 35. Public Access Activities

Library Type	Staff Training	Bibliographic Instruction	Promotion
Academic ARL	14, or 93.3%	15, or 100%	11, or 73.3%
Academic non ARL	11, or 91.7%	15, or 100%	8, or 66.7%

A majority of both ARL and non ARL libraries subscribe to Regional-L. More ARL libraries subscribe to a local listserve and are more likely to administer that list.(Table 36.).

Table 36. Peer Connection by Library Type

Library Type	Regional-L	Local List	Administer Local List	E-Mail Reference
Academic ARL	14, or 93.3%	6, or 40%	6, or 40%	9, or 60%
Academic non ARL	10, or 83.3%	3, or 25%	1, or 8.3%	9, or 75%

In summary, the data generated by this survey suggest that there is not much difference between academic ARL and non ARL library regionals in their

provision of public access to depository machine readable information. Regionals at ARL libraries are more apt to serve larger populations and have larger materials budgets. 80% of the reporting ARL regionals with OPAC's include depository machine readable information in the OPAC, compared to 50% of the non ARL regionals. Both types are equipped with public access workstations. A slightly higher percentage of non ARL libraries provide public Internet access. GPO Access is equally provided, but ARL libraries are more likely to serve as gateways to GPO Access. A majority of both types are engaged in various methods of staff training and bibliographic instruction, and both types fall down a little when it comes to promoting the depository machine readable collection.

Examination also reveals little difference in the other types: state agency, public, and historical society. These regionals are apt to serve larger populations, with 80% of state agency, the historical society, and all 3 public libraries serving populations of 200,000 or more.

Only 5 of 10 state agency depositories have public access Internet workstations, and all that do have from 1-5. 9, or 90% of the state agency libraries provide access to GPO Access, however, with the majority (77.8%) being on-site GPO Access providers.

State agency libraries are strongest in promotion of machine readable depository collection, 80% doing some kind of promotion. 2 of the 3 public libraries do no promotion.

FUTURE RESEARCH

The 41 regionals responding to this survey do not represent the entire depository community. Questions for future research arise. Future research might look at the depository community as a whole, or depositories that serve smaller populations. A possible study might focus on depositories that serve rural areas.

Other possible research might examine the inclusion of bibliographic records of the depository machine readable collections in the OPAC. This is apparently still a problem. Smith raised bibliographic questions in her 1990 research, and these questions remain (311).

Also, why is there not a stronger trend toward promoting the machine readable depository collection and services?

CONCLUSION

The results of this survey reveal that regional depository libraries are creating environments that support the shift to electronic dissemination of depository information. As indicated in the January 15, 1995 Administrative Notes, public access microcomputer workstations are not yet required by GPO, but they are recommended (5). 100% of the responding regionals provide public access to depository CD-ROM's, and have public access workstations.

The number of regionals with Internet access is growing rapidly. The 1994 LPS study reported that 25 regionals provided public access to the Internet. Encouragingly, 30, or 73.2% of the regionals responding to this 1995 survey provide public access to the Internet. As Wayne P. Kelley, Superintendent of Documents, wrote in a letter sent to all depository directors and published in Administrative Notes, "Internet dissemination is becoming the de facto standard for many Federal information products, as well as supporting timely public participation in the interactive processes of Government." (Kelley 1995, 3) It is promising that 73.2% of the responding regionals provide public access to the Internet. It is also encouraging that 31, or 78% of the responding regionals provide public access to GPO Access, and that 10 of these are gateways to GPO Access. A GPO near-term goal is to have a gateway in each state by the end of the 1995 fiscal year.

Bibliographic instruction enhances public access to depository machine readable information; it improves users' skills and enables them to maximize the benefits they gain from the depository resources (Hernon and McClure 1988, 172). Furthermore, in improving user skills and confidence, bibliographic instruction results in reduced dependence on depository staff. 97.6% of the responding regionals provide some type of bibliographic instruction for patrons to assist them in using depository machine readable information.

Training librarians, as intermediaries, to effectively access electronic depository information, is one of the primary keys to assuring public access. Always important for effective access of depository information, staff training is especially imperative now, if rapidly changing information technology is to improve access to depository information, rather than create a barrier to it (McClure 1991, 34). Furthermore, training in new technologies and services improves the confidence level of the staff and reduces stress. Apparently, regionals recognize the importance of staff training. As shown above, 92.5% train their staff in providing assistance to public users of depository machine readable information.

The results are not so positive when it comes to the promotion of depository machine readable information, with only 70.7% of the regionals engaging in promotional or outreach activities. Kessler and Daniels also found that regionals were "not too good" when it came to publicizing their services (Kessler and Daniels 1989, 15). Promotional and outreach activities are key, along with bibliographic instruction and staff training, to the enhancement of public access to electronic depository materials. Promotion and outreach activities make users and potential users aware that the depository machine readable collection may satisfy their information needs. Increased awareness means increased access. Nevertheless, as Hernon and McClure point out, "Since many depository library collections are

operated by a small number of staff charged with developing and maintaining the collection, documents 'outreach' programs are frequently available only on a small scale." (Hernon and McClure 1988, 172)

As a result of the Conference on the Future of Federal Government Information, the Government Documents Round Table recommended that depository libraries "Strongly encourage and support sharing and expertise to insure access to electronic information products." ("Reinventing Access..." 1993, 17) 37, or 90.2% of the regionals subscribe to Regional-L, indicating a high level of peer connection and quite possibly daily contact with peers. Communication with selectives seems to have improved since 1989, when Kessler and Daniels found "communication with selectives to be somewhat haphazard." (Kessler and Daniels 1989, 16). 27, or 65.9% of the responding regionals report providing E-Mail reference to the selectives and other libraries in their region. Indications are that regional E-Mail to selectives would be greater if more selectives had electronic capabilities.

Finally, for the most part, regional librarians show little resistance in meeting the challenge posed by machine readable depository information. 34, or 82.9% believe depository information in machine readable format will improve public access. Some of those not certain that depository information in machine readable format will improve public access express concerns about equity. Also, concerns about adequate depository resources and staffing remain.

Notes

Association of Research Libraries. Technology & U.S. Government Information Policies: Catalysts For New Partnerships. Washington : ARL, 1987.

Dugan, Robert E., and Joan F. Cheverie. "Electronic Government Information and the Depository Library Program: Paradise Found?" Government Information Quarterly 9 (1992) : 269-289.

"GPO Electronic Information Access Enhancement Act." (PL 103-40, 8 June 1993), 107 United States Statutes at Large. p. 112.

Hernon, Peter, and Charles R. McClure. Public Access to Government Information: Issues, Trends, and Strategies. 2nd ed. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex Publishing Corp., 1988.

Hernon, Peter, and Charles R. McClure. "Electronic Census Products and the Depository Library Program: Future Issues and Trends." Government Information Quarterly 8 (1991) : 59-76.

Kelley, Wayne P. Administrative Notes. 16:2 (January 1995) : 1-4.

Kessler, Ridley R., and Evelyn H. Daniel. "A Survey of United States Regional Government Depository Libraries." Unpublished study, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1989.

Kranich, Nancy. "The Public's Right to Know and Electronic Government Information." In Citizen Rights and Access to Electronic Information: the LITA President's Program Presentations and Background Papers, 107-110. Ed. Dennis J. Reynolds. Chicago: LITA, 1992.

Madison, James. Letter to W.T. Barry. 4 August 1822. The Writings of James Madison. Ed Gaillard Hunt. Vol. XIV 1819-1836. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1910. 103.

McClure, Charles R. "Information Policy Issues and Access to U.S. Government Information." The Reference Librarian. 32 (1991): 25-41.

McClure, Charles R., and Peter Hernon. Users of Academic and Public GPO Depository Libraries Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1989.

"Recommended Minimum Technical Guidelines for Federal Depository Libraries " Administrative Notes 16:2 (January 1995) : 5-6.

"Reinventing Access to Federal Government Information: Report of the Conference on the Future of Federal Governement Information." Government Documents Discussion List [Online] (October 1993): 17.

Rocha, Sinai P., and John S. Wilson. "A Survey of Automated Bibliographic Access of Government Documents in Texas Documents Libraries." Documents to the People. 21 (1993): 212-213.

"Seven Electronic Information Goals." Documents to the People. 20 (1992): 59.

Smith, Diane H. "Depository Libraries in the 1990's: Whither or Wither Depositories?" Government Information Quarterly 17 (1990): 301-324.

"Statement on the Signing the Goverment Printing Office Electronic Information Access Enhancement Act, " Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents. 29:23 (8 June 1993) pp. 1043-1044.

Title 44, U.S. Code, Section 1911, 1988 ed.

U.S. Government Printing Office. Annual Report 1993. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1993.

U.S. Government Printing Office. GPO Access: Information for Depository Libraries. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1995 (pamphlet).

U.S. Government Printing Office. Library Programs Service. Electronic Capabilities of Federal Depository Libraries, Summer 1994. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1995.

Bibliography

Association of Research Libraries. Technology & U.S. Government Information Policies: Catalysts For New Partnerships. Washington : ARL, 1987.

Doctor, Ronald D. "Information Technologies and Social Equity: Confronting the Revolution." Journal of the American Society for Information Science. 42 no. 3 (1991): 216-228.

Doctor, Ronald D. "Social Equity and Information Technologies: Moving Toward Information Democracy." Annual Review of Information Science and Technology. 27 (1992): 43-96.

Dugan, Robert E., and Joan F. Cheverie. "Electronic Government Information and the Depository Library Program: Paradise Found?" Government Information Quarterly 9 (1992) : 269-289.

"GPO Electronic Information Access Enhancement Act." (PL 103-40, 8 June 1993), 107 United States Statutes at Large. p. 112.

Hernon, Peter, and Charles R. McClure. Public Access to Government Information: Issues, Trends, and Strategies. 2nd ed. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex Publishing Corp., 1988.

Hernon, Peter, and Charles R. McClure. "Electronic Census Products and the Depository Library Program: Future Issues and Trends." Government Information Quarterly 8 (1991) : 59-76.

Hernon, Peter, and Charles R. McClure. "Electronic U.S. Government Information: Policy Issues and Directions." Annual Review of Information Science and Technology 28 (1993): 45- 110.

Hernon, Peter, Charles R. McClure, and Gary R. Purcell. GPO's Depository Library Program: A Descriptive Analysis. Norwood, NJ: Alex Publishing Corporation, 1985.

Hernon, Peter, and David C. Heisser. "GPO Regional Depositories." The Reference Librarian. 32 (1991): 43-55.

Kessler, Ridley R., and Evelyn H. Daniel. "A Survey of United States Regional Government Depository Libraries." Unpublished study, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1989.

McClure, Charles R. "Information Policy Issues and Access to U.S. Government Information." The Reference Librarian. 32 (1991): 25-41.

McClure, Charles R., and Peter Hernon. Users of Academic and Public GPO Depository Libraries Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1989.

"Reinventing Access to Federal Government Information: Report of the Conference on the Future of Federal Governement Information." Government Documents Discussion List [Online]. Available e-mail: WINDY-L%UIUCVMD. bitnet@vm42.cso.uiuc.edu

Reynolds, Dennis J., ed. Citizen Rights and Access to Electronic Information: the LITA President's Program Presentations and Background Papers. Chicago: LITA, 1992.

Rocha, Sinai P., and John S. Wilson. "A Survey of Automated Bibliographic Access of Government Documents in Texas Documents Libraries." Documents to the People. 21 (1993): 212-213.

Ronfeldt, David. "Cyberocracy is Coming." The Information Society. 8 (1992) : 243-296.

Ryan, Susan M. "CD-ROM's in U.S. Depository Libraries: A Survey of Hardware, Software, Staffing and Service." Government Publications Review.20 (1993): 495-513.

Schiller, Herbert I., and Anita R. Schiller. "Libraries, Public Access to Information, and Commerce." The Political Economy of Information. Ed. Vincent Mosco and Janet Wasko. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1987. 146-166.

"Seven Electronic Information Goals." Documents to the People. 20 (1992): 59.

Smith, Diane H. "Depository Libraries in the 1990's: Whither or Wither Depositories?" Government Information Quarterly 17 (1990) : 301-324.

Title 44, U.S. Code, Section 1911, 1988 ed.

U.S. Congress. House, Committee on Government Operations, Creative Ways of Using and Disseminating Federal Information. 102nd Congress, 1st and 2nd Sessions. June 19, 1991 and June 4, 1992.

U.S. Congress. House, Committee on Government Operations, Reauthorization of the Paperwork Reduction Act and the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs. 101st Congress, 1st Session. July 25, 27; August1 and 2, 1989.

U.S. Congress. Joint Committee on Printing. Government Information as a Public Asset. 102nd Congress, 1st Session. 25 April 1991.

U.S. Congress. Joint Committee on Printing. New Technology and the Government Printing Office 102nd Congress, 1st Session. June 19 and July 24, 1991.

U.S. Congress. Office of Technology Assessment. Critical Connections: Communications for the Future. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1990.

U.S. Congress. Office of Technology Assessment. Federal Government Provision of Public Information: Issues Related to Public Access, Technology and Laws/Regulations... Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1984.

U.S. Congress. Office of Technology Assessment. Informing the Nation: Federal Information Dissemination in the Electronic Age. Washington D.C. :U.S. Government Printing Office, 1988.

U.S. Congress. Senate, Committee on Labor and Human Resources, Libraries and their Role in the Information Infrastructure. 103rd Congress, 2nd Session. April 19, 1994.

U.S. Department of Commerce. Use of Census Bureau in GPO Depository Libraries: Future Issues and Trends. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1990.

U.S. General Accounting Office. Federal Information, Agency Needs and Practices, (GAO Report, B- 231160.2). Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1988.

U.S. Government Printing Office Annual Report 1993. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1993.

U.S. Government Printing Office. Library Programs Service. Electronic Capabilities of Federal Depository Libraries, Summer 1994. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1995.

U.S. National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. Public Libraries and the Internet: Study Results, Policy Issues, and Recommendations. Washington D.C. : U.S. Government Printing Office, 1994.

APPENDIX A: Regional Depository Electronic Access Survey

30 March 1995

Dear ,

I am conducting a study of Regional Depository Libraries as part of the Master's paper required for completion of my Masters of Science in Library Science at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Ridley Kessler, Documents Librarian, phone (919) 962-1356, has been kind enough to act as my advisor on this project.

The objective of this research project is to assess how government information in machine-readable form is affecting Regional Depository Libraries, and more specifically, how this technology is affecting public access to government information.

Enclosed with this letter is a questionnaire that asks questions about your library, documents collection, and your machine-readable government information practices. Your participation is voluntary, and greatly appreciated. In order to assure anonymity, please do not write your name on the questionnaire. Please return the completed questionnaire in the enclosed pre addressed envelope within 14 days of receipt, and no later than **17 April 1995**. If you would like to receive a summary of the findings, contact me by E-Mail at fords@ruby.ils.unc.edu and I will send you a copy.

I have a keen interest, as I'm sure you do, in public access to government information. Your participation in this study will help me describe the current situation and identify problems, with the hopes of arriving at solutions to these problems.

Sincerely,

Stephanie Ford
(919) 968-0356

You may contact the UNC-CH Academic Affairs Institutional Review Board at the following address and telephone number at any time during this study if you have questions or concerns about your rights as a research subject.

Academic Affairs Institutional Review Board
Frances A. Campbell, Chair
CB# 4100, 300 Bynum Hall
The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27599-4100
(919) 966-5625

SECTION ONE
Please respond to the following questions about your library and its federal depository collection.

1. What category of library best describes your library? Check one.

   a._____ Academic library (member of Association of Research Libraries)

   b._____ Academic library (not a member of Association of Research Libraries)

   c._____ Public Library

   d._____ State agency library

   e._____ Other (please specify)_____

2. What size community (academic and /or town) does your library primarily serve?

   a._____ population 200,000 or more

   b._____ population 100,000-199,999

   c._____ population 50,000-99,999

   d._____ population 25,000-49,999

   e._____ population 10,000-24,999

   f._____ population less than 10,000

3. What is the arrangement of your documents collection?

   a._____Separate (i.e., the majority of the documents collection is kept together physically)

   b._____Integrated (i.e. the majority of the documents collection is disbursed into the regular library collection that is not considered documents related)

   c._____Separate but partially integrated (i.e., part of the documents collection is physically separate and part is disbursed into the regular collection)

   1. If your collection is separate or partially integrated, what percentage of the documents collection is kept in the separate collection?

      (A)_____0%-24%

      (B)_____25%-49%

      (C)_____ 50%-74%

      (D)_____75%-100

4. Does the documents collection have its own budget/funds for materials acquisition that the Regional Librarian controls or administers?

a._____No fund or budget

b._____Has separate budget or fund

c._____Shares fund or budget with other department/section/unit

5. If the documents collection does have its own budget/fund, what is the size of the budget?

a._____Less than $1,000.00

b._____$1,000.00 to $4,999.00

c._____$5,000.00 to $9,999.00

d._____$10,000.00 to $24999.00

e._____$25,000.00 to $49999.00

f._____More than $50,000.00

6 What is the number of professional librarians working in the documents collection?

a._____Full time

b._____Part time

7. Total number of hours per week (includes full and part time) of professional librarians working in the documents collection?_____

8. Number of non-professional employees (not student) working in the documents collection?

a._____Full time

b. _____Part time

9. Total number of hours per week of non-professional employees (includes full and part time -not students) working in the documents collection?_____

10. Total number of hours per week of student help working in the documents collection?

a._____Hours per week

11. Please estimate the number of hours devoted to documents each week? (includes public service, processing, collection development, training, etc.)

a._____Hours of professional time per week

b._____Hours of support staff time per week

c._____Hours of student assistant or volunteer time per week

12. Does your depository collection contain any items in machine readable format?

a._____ Yes

b._____ No

If yes for #12 proceed with the following questions. If no, please return the questionnaire in the attached self addressed stamped envelope.

SECTION TWO

Please respond to the questions beginning on the following page about your Federal depository machine readable data collection.

13. What is the number of hours devoted to the machine readable depository collection by depository personnel? (includes public service, processing, collection development, training, etc.)

a. _____Hours of professional time per week

b. _____Hours of support staff time per week

c. _____Hours of student assistant time per week

14. Where is the machine readable depository collection of CD-ROMs and diskettes located? (Check the one that best describes your situation)

a._____ Documents department, in private or locked area

b._____ Documents department, in open stack area, or networked on a local area network (LAN)

c._____ Public services/Reference Department in private or locked area,

d._____ Public services/Reference Department in open stack area, or networked on a LAN

15. Is the depository staff, or other library staff more responsible for maintaining depository software and hardware?

a._____ Depository (percent)_____

b._____ Other library staff (Please specify)_____(percent)_____

16. Which of the following machine readable data formats are available for public access in your depository library? (Check all that apply).

a._____ Floppy disks

b._____ CD-ROMs

c._____ Video Disks

d._____ Internet

e._____ Other (Please specify)_____

17. Do you have workstations available for public use of depository products and services?

a._____yes

b._____no

c. If yes to #17, how many workstations?

1._____1-5

2._____6-10

3._____11-15

d. If yes to #17, how many workstations are specifically designated for use by depository patrons?

1._____1-5

2._____6-10

3._____11 or more

18. Does your depository library provide public access workstations for public access to the Internet?

a. _____No

b._____Yes

c. If yes to #18, how many workstations?

1._____1-5

2._____6-10

3._____11 or more

d. If yes to #18, how many workstations are specifically designated for use by depository patrons?

1._____1-5

2._____6-10

3._____11 or more

19. If your depository library provides public access to the Internet, what type of connection to the Internet does your library have? (Check all that apply)

a._____Internet E-mail of some kind

b._____VT100 terminal access to a host on the Internet. (e.g., through library's OPAC)

c._____Dial up SLIP, or PPP TCP/IP on a desktop machine

d._____Direct, dedicated leased line connection

e._____Other (Please specify):_____

f._____Don't know

20. If your depository library provides public access to the Internet, what type of Internet applications does your depository library provide? (Check all that apply)

a._____World Wide Web (Mosaic, Netscape)

b._____Gopher

c._____Telnet

d._____FTP

e._____WAIS

21. Please estimate the number of times per week the documents staff provides access to government documents through the Internet connection.

a._____Never

b._____Less than 5 times per week

c._____5-15 times per week

d._____More than 15 times per week

22. Does your depository library provide public access to GPO Access?

a._____ yes

b._____ no

If yes to question 22, please answer questions 23-25. If no to 22, please skip to question 26.

23. Which level of GPO Access service does your depository library provide?

a_____on-site service

b_____extended on-site service (for users networked at the institution)

c._____gateway service (for off-site public users, i.e., users beyond institution or library walls.)

24. Which GPO Access database subscription does your library have? (check all that apply)

1._____Federal Register databases

2_____Congressional Record databases

3_____Congressional Bills databases

25. Is your GPO Access support person (registered with GPO) part of the documents staff?

a._____yes

b._____no

26 . Does your library have an Online Public Access Catalog (OPAC)?

a._____ yes

b._____ no

27. If yes to 26, are the depository machine readable data collection bibliographic records included in the OPAC?

a._____ yes

b._____ no

28. Is your depository library staff trained in providing service for depository machine readable collections?

a._____ yes

b._____ no

29. If yes to #28, how was this training accomplished?

a._____ Workshops, training, or classes held by own staff

b._____Workshops, training, or classes held by federal government agency personnel

c._____ Workshops, training, or classes held by outside experts, other than government experts

d._____ Other. (Please specify)_____

_____

30. What type of bibliographic instruction is done for patrons to assist them in using depository machine readable information?

a._____ None

b._____ One on one instruction

c._____ Classroom instruction

d._____ Other (Please specify)_____

_____

_____

31. What type of outreach and promotional activities are done to inform the general public about the depository machine readable collection?

a_____none

b._____workshops or group demonstrations

c._____brochures and handouts

d._____newspaper articles, press release

e._____other (Please specify)_____

32. Is there a method in place in your depository library to track patron interest in or requests for depository information in machine readable data format, specifically? (e.g., keeping statistics)

a._____ yes

b._____ no

33. If yes to question #32, in an average 5-day period, how many times is depository information in machine readable format used?

a._____0-5

b._____6-10

c._____11-15

d._____16-20

e._____21 and over

34. Do you offer E-Mail reference for Selective Depository Libraries and other libraries in your region?

a._____yes

b._____no

35. Do you subscribe to Regional-L?

a._____yes

b._____no

36. Do you have a Listserve for your regional area?

a._____yes

b._____no

c.If yes, does the Regional Depository Library administer the Listserve?

1._____yes

2._____no

37. Do you think depository information in machine readable format will improve patron access?

a._____ yes

b._____ no

If the return envelope is lost, the return address is:

Stephanie Ford
347 Summerwalk Circle
Chapel Hill, NC 27514

Please use the space below for any additional comments or opinions you might have regarding the provision of access to federal government information in machine readable format by depository libraries. Thank you for your participation in this study.